



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,844	06/15/2001	Vellore T. Vetrivelkumaran	1018.110US1	2812
23460	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER, LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE CHICAGO, IL 60601-6780			BARQADLE, YASIN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/681,844

Applicant(s)

VETRIVELKUMARAN ET AL.

Examiner

Yasin M Barqadle

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-16 and 18-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Resposns to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on October 01, 2004 has been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive. However, further study of the references examiner finds claim 33 objectionable.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 33 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the original computing device" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2153

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the original computing device" in lines 2, 3 and 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the original computing device" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the original computing device" in lines 2 and 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Response to Arguments

In response to applicant's arguments on page 15, first paragraph that " each rejection includes Domenikos as part of the combination because none of Raz, Bittinger or Eylon describes, "executing and application program outside of [a] client computing device." Applicant further argues that the references "implicitly and explicitly teach away from executing outside of the client computing device." (Office action mailed July 1, page 7, line 3-4)". Applicant sites Eylon, paragraph 0073 to show that the server's operating environment does not need to be

Art Unit: 2153

compatible with the client environment. Examiner notes that Eylon is not part of the combination in page 7 of the office action as argued by the applicant. Therefore, Eylon's statement has no bearing on the rejection made on page 7 of the office action that relates to independent claims 1, 15 and 28.

Furthermore, Eylon teaches that "While the efficiency with which a streamed application is executed on the client machine can vary depending on the order in which the streamlets are delivered, provided that the server is generally compatible with the basic communication protocols and data format used by the client..." (see paragraph 0039). On paragraph 0016, Eylon teaches, "Preferably, each streamlet is stored in a pre-compressed format on the server and decompressed upon receipt by the client." Therefore, it is clear that the server and the client must use the same format for the client to be able to decompress streamlets (application portions).

Domenikos' reference in combination with Raz and Bittinger teach the new limitation that requires the application program to execute on a compatible computing platform at the computing device where the execution occurs, (see col. 4, lines 8-49 and col. 14, lines 11-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-16, 18-22, 28-33 and 38-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz et al U.S. Pub. (20020138640) in view of Bittinger et al USPN (5859971) and further in view of Domenikos et al USPN. (6115741).

As per claim 1, 15 and 28, Raz et al teach a method, machine-readable medium and a computing device for executing an application program comprising:

receiving a request in a caching computing device, the request for a component of the application program [Fig. 1 shows Server 110 receiving requests from downstream devices for application program 120, Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0038];

determining whether or not the request relates to a

Art Unit: 2153

cacheable application program component that has been previously cached [Fig. 1 shows Server 110 receiving requests from downstream devices for application program 120, paragraphs 0015-0017; 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0038];

directing the request to the cacheable application program component in response to a determination that the request relates to the component that has been cached [Fig. 3; Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-40]; and,

otherwise, passing the request to further computing device [Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0043-0045].

Although Raz et al shows substantial features of the claimed invention, he does not explicitly show an internal intercepting component of an original computing device, the internal intercepting component capable of intercepting the request when it is internal to the original computing device and redirecting the request to the caching computing device.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Raz et al, as evidenced by Bittinger et al USPN. (5859971).

In analogous art, Bittinger et al whose invention is a method for reducing the data transmitted over an external

Art Unit: 2153

communication link from a first application resident in a first computer to a second application resident in a second computer and storing a data stream from the first application to be provided to the second application in response to a request from the second application in a cache resident in the first computer, disclose an internal intercepting component of another computing device, the internal intercepting component capable of intercepting the request when it is internal to the another computing device and redirecting the request [fig. 2, client side intercept 30 and server side intercept 40, Col. 13, lines 20 to col. 14, line 14. see also col. 3-51]. Giving the teaching of Bittinger et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Raz et al by employing the system of Bittinger et al in order to minimize the amount and frequency of communication required over a communication link [abstract and col. 7, lines 52-67].

Although Raz et al and Bittinger et al show substantial features of the claimed invention, they do not explicitly show executing an application program outside of client computing device,

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Raz

Art Unit: 2153

et al and Bittinger et al, as evidenced by Domenikos et al USPN. (6115741).

In analogous art, Domenikos et al whose invention is a system for executing application programs stored in a memory linked to a server, disclose a server for executing an application program outside of client computing device [Col. 4, lines 34-49]. Giving the teaching of Domenikos et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Raz et al and Bittinger et al by employing the system of Domenikos et al so that users could have the flexibility of executing application programs on remote servers in order to reduce the processing load from the client computers.

Domenikos, furtherer teaches the caching computing device having an execution platform compatible with the application program (col. 4, lines 8-49 and col. 14, lines 11-27).

As per claim 2, Raz et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the cacheable application program component constitutes the only component of a cacheable application program, such that the cacheable application program is wholly cached by caching the cacheable application program component [Page 4, paragraphs 0037 and paragraph 0049].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 3, Raz et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein previously cached cacheable application program component was previously cached by downloading one or more installation files for the cacheable application program component from the original computing device [paragraphs 0015-0017 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040]; and,

installing the cacheable application program component onto the caching computing device by utilizing the one or more installation files [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040 and Page 7, paragraphs 0061].

As per claim 5, Raz et al as modified teach the method of claim 1, wherein the request is passed to the original computing device, and the method further comprising:

receiving the request by the original computing device, as has been passed by the caching computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0043-0044]; and,

executing the application program component by the original computing device for the client computing device [see Domenikos et al Col. 4, lines 34-49].

As per claim 8, Raz et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein the steps of caching, receiving, determining, directing and

Art Unit: 2153

passing are performed by a client computing device, and directing the application program component request to the cacheable application program component that has been cached comprises executing the application program component by the client computing device for itself [Page 2, paragraphs 0016-0017 and paragraphs 0025-0026]. .

As per claim 9, Raz et al teach the method of claim 8, wherein the request is passed to the original computing device, and the method further comprising:

receiving the request by the original computing device [Page, 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0038]; and executing the application program component by the original computing device for the client computing device [see Domenikos et al Col. 4, lines 34-49].

As per claim 10, Raz et al teach the method of claim 8, wherein the request is passed to a caching computing device, and the method further comprising:

receiving the request by a caching computing device [Page, 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0038];

determining by the caching computing device whether the request relates to a cacheable application program component that has been cached by the caching computing device [Page 3,

Art Unit: 2153

paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0038];

directing the application program component request by the caching computing device to the cacheable application program component that has been cached by the caching computing device in

Response to determining that the request relates to the component that has been cached by the caching computing device [Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-40]; and

otherwise, passing the application program component request by the caching computing device to the original computing device [Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0043-0045].

As per claim 11, Domenikos et al as modified teach the method of claim 10, wherein directing the application program component request by the caching computing device comprises executing the application program component by the caching computing device for the client computing device in lieu of execution by the original computing device for the client computing device [Col. 4, lines 34-49].

As per claim 12, Raz et al teach the method of claim 10, further comprising subsequent to passing the application program

component request by the caching computing device to the original computing device:

receiving the request by the original computing device, as has been passed by the caching computing device [Page 3, paragraphs 0032]; and,

executing the application program component by the original computing device for the client computing device [see Domenikos et al Col. 4, lines 34-49].

As per claim 16 and 29, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein the cacheable application program component constitutes the only component of a cacheable application program, such that the cacheable application program is wholly cached by caching the cacheable application program component [Page 4, paragraphs 0037 and paragraph 0049].

As per claim 18, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein directing the application program component request to the cacheable application component that has been cached comprises executing the application program component by the client computing device for itself in lieu of execution by one of a caching computing device and the original computing device for the client computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0043-45].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 19, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein passing the application program component request to another computing device comprises passing the request to one of a caching computing device and the original computing device [Fig. 3, page 4, paragraphs 0041-49].

As per claim 20, Raz et al teach the medium of claim 15, wherein the computing device comprises a caching computing device [Fig. 2, clients 180, 190 and 200].

As per claim 21 and 31, Domenikos et al as modified teach the invention, wherein directing the application program request to the cacheable application component that has been cached comprises executing the application program component by the caching computing device for a client computing device in lieu of execution by the original computing device for the client computing device [Col. 4, lines 34-49].

As per claim 22 and 32, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein passing the application program component request to another computing device comprises passing the request to the original computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0043-49].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 30, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein the computing device comprises a client computing device [Fig. 2, clients 220-240].

As per claim 33, Raz et al teach the device of claim 28, wherein the direction component comprises:

a first handler to determine whether a request comprises an application program component request for any cacheable application program component that has been cached [Fig. 3, page 3, paragraphs 0028-32 and page 4, paragraphs 0043-49];

a second handler for the application program component that has been cached [Fig. 3, page 3, paragraphs 0028-32 and page 4, paragraphs 0043-49]; and,

a third handler to receive the request from the first handler in response to the first handler determining that the request comprises an application program request for any cacheable application program component that has been cached, and to direct the request to the second handler in response to determining that the request relates to the application program

component that has been cached [Fig. 3, page 3, paragraphs 0028-32 and page 4, paragraphs 0043-49].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 38, Raz et al teach a computing device comprising:

a cacheable application program component that has been cached from an original computing device [abstract and page 3, paragraphs 0025-32]; and,

a component to execute the application program component in lieu of execution by the original computing device [page, 2, paragraphs 0016-17 and page 3, paragraphs 0025-32].

As per claim 38, regarding the limitation, in response to a request, the request from an internal intercepting component capable of intercepting and redirecting the request, see the rejection and the combination made on claims 1, 15 and 28 above.

As per claim 39 and 40, Raz et al teach the device of claim 38, wherein the computing device is a client computing device, and the component to execute the application program component executes the application program component for itself in lieu of execution by the original computing device for the client computing device [page, 2, paragraphs 0016-17 and page 3, paragraphs 0025-32].

Regarding the limitation, the client device including the internal intercepting component, the internal intercepting component intercepting and redirecting the request, see the

Art Unit: 2153

rejection and the combination made on claims 1, 15 and 28 above.

As to transparent to user see Bittinger et al col. 20, 54-62].

As per claim 41, Raz et al teach a system comprising:

a client computing device communicatively connected to a network [Fig. 2]; and

a caching computing device to cache at least one cacheable application program component from an original computing device and execute the at least one component for the client computing device in response to the request, the caching computing device also communicatively connected to the network [Fig.3 and Page 3, paragraphs 0032 and Page 4, paragraphs 0037-40].

As per the limitation of enabling the caching computing device to execute the cached application program components (see claims 1, 15 and 28 above).

As per claim 41, regarding the limitation, the client computing device including an internal intercepting component capable of intercepting and redirecting a request, see the rejection and the combination made on claims 1, 15 and 28 above.

as per claims 42 and 44, Raz et al teach the invention, wherein any of the at least one application program components cached by

Art Unit: 2153

the caching computing device constitute the only component of a cacheable application program, such that the cacheable application program is wholly cached by the caching computing device caching the cacheable application program component [Page 4, paragraphs 0037 and paragraph 0049].

As per claim 43, Raz et al teach the system of claim 41, wherein the client computing device is further to cache at least one cacheable application program component from the original computing device and execute the at least one component for itself [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0041 and paragraph 0049].

As per claim 45, Raz et al teach the system of claim 41, wherein the original computing device is also communicatively connected to the network [Fig. 3].

As per claim 46, Raz et al teach the system of claim 41, wherein the original computing device is communicatively connected to a second network, the caching computing device also communicatively connected to the second network [Fig. 3].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 47, the claim includes similar limitations addressed in claims 1, 15 and 28 above. Therefore, it is rejected with the same rationale.

As per claim 48, Raz et al teach the method of claim 47 further comprising providing results of executing the application program or the component thereof from the caching computing device to the client computing device [Col. 5, lines 13-33].

As per claim 49, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 1, wherein caching each cacheable application program component of the application program comprises retrieving a manifest for the application program, the manifest comprising:

- al least one reference to at least one file for the application program (col. 18, lines 19-41);
- an amount of storage space the application program is capable of occupying (col. 17, lines 50 to col. 18, line 17); and
- a platform on which the application program is intended to execute (col. 18, lines 19-58);

As per claim 50, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 49, wherein the manifest further comprises:

- a name of the application program (col. 18, lines 42 to col. 19, line 39);

a version of the application program (col. 17, lines 36-49); and

a brief description of the application program (fig. 8 and col. 21, lines 3-29).

As per claim 51, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 49, wherein caching each cacheable application program component of the application program further comprises verifying that a platform where the component of the application program is being cached is compatible with the platform on which the application program is intended to execute (col. 18, lines 42 to col. 19, line 39).

As per claim 52, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 49, wherein the platform on which the application program is intended to execute is specified as a minimum version of a computing device operating system on which the application program is capable of executing col. 18, lines 42 to col. 19, line 39).

As per claim 53, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 49, wherein caching each cacheable

Art Unit: 2153

application program component of the application program further comprises updating a registry, the registry comprising:

an original location of the cacheable application program component (col. 16, lines 1-54 and col. 22, lines 31-41); and

a cached location of the cacheable application program component (col. 16, lines 1-54 and col. 22, lines 31-41).

As per claim 54, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 53, wherein:

the registry further comprises a guaranteed unique identifier (GUID) for the application program (col. 13, lines 34-54); and

the cached location of the cacheable application program component comprises a cryptographic hash of the guaranteed unique identifier for the application program ((col. 13, lines 34-54)).

As per claim 55, Domenikos et al teach the method of claim 53, wherein the registry further

comprises:

an installation time of the cacheable application program component and a last accessed time of the cacheable application

Art Unit: 2153

program component (col. 16, lines 1-54 and col. 22, lines 31-41).

As per claim 56, Domenikos et al teach the device of claim 28, wherein the redirection component comprises:

an application protocol handler (fig. 3, col. 10, lines 44-58 and col. 16, 55-67) configured to, at least:

intercept requests to execute application program components, each request referencing at least one application program component (col. 17, lines 36 to col. 18, line 18) ; and pass through other types of request (col. 17, lines 36 to col. 18, line 18);

a plurality of local application handlers corresponding to a plurality of cached application program components (fig. 6 and fig. 7); and

a local name resolution handler configured to, at least;

receive requests to execute application program components from the application protocol handler (col. 15, lines 58 to col. 16, lines 54 and col. 17, lines 19-61); and

resolve each of the at least one application program component to at least one of the plurality of local application handlers (col. 15, lines 58 to col. 16, lines 54 and col. 18, lines 5-41).

Art Unit: 2153

3. Claims 6-7,13-14,23-27 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz et al US. Pub.(20020138640) in view of Bittinger et al USPN. (5859971) and further in view of Domenikos et al USPN. (6115741) and further in view of Eylon et al US Pub. (20010034736).

As per claim 6, although Raz et al, Bittinger et al and Domenikos et al show substantial features of the claimed invention as explained above in claims 1,15 and 28, they do not explicitly show tracking client computing device usage of a cacheable application program component to which the application program component request relates.

Nonetheless, this feature is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Raz et al and Bittinger et al, as evidenced by Eylon et al US Pub. (20010034736).

In analogous art, Eylon et al whose invention is about a method for executing network streamed applications, disclose a system which tracks client computing device usage pattern of cacheable application program component based upon information gathered from user interaction with the application [page 2, paragraph 0020 & 0035 and Page 7, paragraphs 0065].

Giving the teaching of Eylon et al, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and the advantage of modifying Raz et al, Bittinger et al and Domenikos et al by employing the system of Eylon et al in order to determine an optimal order in which to send application program component to a client [Page 7, paragraph 0065].

As per claim 6, Eylon et al teach the invention further comprising:

assessing whether the usage is sufficient to justify caching of the cacheable application program component by the caching computing device 0016 [Pages 2&3, paragraphs 0020 & 0035 and Page 4, paragraphs 0038-41]; and,

caching the application program component at the caching computing device in response to a determination that the usage is sufficient to justify caching [Page 4, paragraphs 0035 and 0038-41].

As per claim 7, Raz et al teach the method of claim 6, wherein caching the cacheable application program component at the caching computing device comprises:

downloading one or more installation files for the cacheable application program component by the caching computing

Art Unit: 2153

device from the original computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040]; and,

installing the cacheable application program component at the caching computing device by the caching computing device, utilizing the one or more installation files [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040 and Page 7, paragraphs 0061].

As per claim 13, see the rejection made on claim 6 above.

As per claim 14, see the rejection made on claim 3 above.

As per claim 23, Eylon et al teach machine-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for execution by a processor of a computing device to perform a method comprising:

tracking usage by a client computing device of cacheable application program component of an application program stored on an original computing device relate [Pages 2&3, paragraphs 0020 & 0035 and Page 7, paragraphs 0065-0066; see claim 6 above for further explanation];

assessing whether or not the usage is sufficient to justify caching any of the cacheable application program components from the original computing device [Page 3, paragraph 0035 and Page 4, paragraphs 0038-41]; and

caching any of the application program components from the original computing device that the usage of which has been

Art Unit: 2153

assessed as sufficient to justifying caching [Page 3, paragraph 0035 and Page 4, paragraphs 0038-41],

Domenikos, teaches the caching computing device having an execution platform compatible with the application program (col. 4, lines 8-49 and col. 14, lines 11-27).

As per the limitation of enabling the caching computing device to execute the cached application program components (see claims 1, 15 and 28 above).

As per claim 24, Raz et al teach the medium of claim 23, wherein the application program consist of one or more cacheable components, such that the entire application program can be cached [Page 4, paragraphs 0037 and paragraph 0049].

As per claim 25, Raz et al teach the medium of claim 23, wherein caching any of the application program components comprises downloading one or more installation files from the original computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040].

As per claim 26, Raz et al teach the medium of claim 23, wherein the computing device is a client computing device [Fig. 2, clients 220-240].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 27, Raz et al teach the medium of claim 23, wherein the computing device is a caching computing device [Fig. 2, clients 180 and 190].

As per claims 34-36, see the rejection made on claims 6 and 23 above.

As per claim 37, Raz et al teach the device of claim 36, wherein the caching component is to cache any of the application program components by downloading one or more installation files from the original computing device [Page 4, paragraphs 0037-0040].

Conclusion

1. **ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will

Art Unit: 2153

expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yasin Barqadle whose telephone number is 703-305-5971. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Yasin Barqadle



FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER